

Chaos in the mixed even-spin models

Wei-Kuo Chen*

December 3, 2012

Abstract

We consider a disordered system obtained by coupling two mixed even-spin models together. The chaos problem is concerned with the behavior of the coupled system when the external parameters in the two models, such as, temperature, disorder, or external field, are slightly different. It is conjectured that the overlap between two independently sampled spin configurations from, respectively, the Gibbs measures of the two models is essentially concentrated around a constant under the coupled Gibbs measure. Using the extended Guerra replica symmetry breaking bound together with a recent development of controlling the overlap using the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities as well as a new family of identities, we present rigorous results on chaos in temperature. In addition, chaos in disorder and in external field are addressed.

Keywords: spin glass models, chaos

1 Introduction and main results

The chaos problem is a very old one in the spin glass theory. It arose from the discovery that in some models, a small change in the external parameters, such as temperature, disorder, or external field, will result in a dramatic change to the overall energy landscape. Furthermore, it may as well change the location of the ground state and the organization of the pure states of the Gibbs measure. It has received a lot of attention and been intensively studied in the context of various models in physics literature in the past decades (e.g. see [13] for a recent review). In recent years, several mathematical results also have been obtained in the problems of chaos in external field and in disorder: An example of chaos in external field for the spherical Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model was given in [12]. Chaos in disorder for mixed even-spin models and without external field was considered in [2], [3] and a more general situation in the presence of external field was handled in [4].

According to physicists' viewpoint [1, 6, 9], chaos in temperature presents intricate difficulties that are very hard to be analyzed both theoretically and experimentally, mainly because this effect is exceedingly small in the perturbation theory. So far mathematically rigorous results are still very scarce. To the best of our knowledge, the only known result

*Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, email: wkchen@math.uchicago.edu

is a “weak” form of chaos in temperature studied in the mixed p -spin models [5]. In this paper, we will focus on the mixed even-spin model and investigate its chaos problem in temperature. Using Guerra’s replica symmetry breaking bound combining with a recent development on the control of the overlap using the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities and a new family of identities, we will present mathematically rigorous results for chaos in temperature. In addition, more general cases of chaos in disorder are considered and results of chaos in external will be addressed.

Let us introduce the mixed even-spin model and the formulation of the chaos problem as follows. Let $\beta = (\beta_p)_{p \geq 1}$ be a sequence of real numbers with $\sum_{p \geq 1} 2^{2p} \beta_p^2 < \infty$. To avoid triviality, throughout this paper, we assume that $\beta_p \neq 0$ for at least one $p \geq 1$. Let h be a r.v. such that its moment generating function exists on $\mathbb{R}$. Given $N \geq 1$, we consider a family of i.i.d. standard Gaussian r.v.

$$\mathcal{G} = (g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}} : \forall 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_{2p} \leq N, \forall p \geq 1) \quad (1.1)$$

and a family of i.i.d. copies of h , $(h_i)_{i \leq N}$. These two families of r.v. are independent of each other. The pure $2p$ -spin Hamiltonians $X_{N,p}(\sigma)$ for $p \geq 1$ indexed by $\sigma \in \Sigma_N := \{-1, +1\}^N$ is defined as

$$X_{N,p}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{N^{p-1/2}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_{2p} \leq N} g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}} \sigma_{i_1} \cdots \sigma_{i_{2p}}. \quad (1.2)$$

The mixed even-spin Hamiltonian is defined as a linear combination,

$$H_N(\sigma) = X_N(\sigma) + \sum_{i \leq N} h_i \sigma_i, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$X_N(\sigma) := \sum_{p \geq 1} \beta_p X_{N,p}(\sigma). \quad (1.4)$$

In physics, the sequence β is called the (inverse) temperature parameters, the family of r.v. $\mathcal{G}$ is called the disorder of the system, and h is called the external field. The covariance of the Gaussian process X_N can be easily computed as

$$\mathbb{E} X_N(\sigma^1) X_N(\sigma^2) = N \xi(R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)),$$

where the quantity $R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) := N^{-1} \sum_{i \leq N} \sigma_i^1 \sigma_i^2$ is called the overlap between two spin configurations $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \Sigma_N$ and $\xi(x) := \sum_{p \geq 1} \beta_p^2 x^{2p}$. We define the Gibbs measure G_N on Σ_N by

$$G_N(\sigma) = \frac{\exp H_N(\sigma)}{Z_N}, \quad (1.5)$$

where the normalizing factor Z_N is called the partition function. An important case of this model is the famous Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model [15], where $\beta_{1,p} = \beta_{2,p} = 0$ for all $p \geq 2$. Now consider two independently sampled spin configurations σ^1 and σ^2

from G_N . It is well-known that under the measure $\mathbb{E}G_N \times G_N$, the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ is essentially concentrated around a constant in some part of the high temperature region, where this region is defined as the set of all temperature parameters such that the infimum in the Parisi formula (see Subsection 2.1 below) is achieved by a Dirac measure. While in the low temperature region, i.e. out side the high temperature region, the overlap is lack of self-averaging property [11] and is conjectured to have a nontrivial weak limit, called the Parisi measure. One typical way of measuring the instability of this spin system occurred by the change of external parameters is to sample independently $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ from G_N and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ from a new Gibbs measure G'_N using a perturbed external parameters from G_N and consider the behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ under $\mathbb{E}G_N \times G'_N$. The phenomenon of chaos states that this overlap behaves very differently and is indeed concentrated near a constant no matter that the two systems G_N and G'_N are in the high or low temperature regime. This is precisely the statement that we will be proving in the paper under some mild assumptions on the external parameters.

Let us define two mixed even-spin models and specify their external parameters in the following. Recall $\mathcal{G}$ from (1.1). Let $\mathcal{G}^1$ and $\mathcal{G}^2$ be two copies of $\mathcal{G}$ such that they together form a jointly Gaussian process. In addition, for every $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_{2p} \leq N$ and $p \geq 1$, the pair $(g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}}^1, g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}}^2)$ is independent of each other and

$$\mathbb{E}g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}}^1 g_{i_1, \dots, i_{2p}}^2 = t_p \in [0, 1].$$

Suppose that h^1 and h^2 are two r.v. that do not depend on $\mathcal{G}^1$ and $\mathcal{G}^2$ and their moment generating functions exist on $\mathbb{R}$. Let (h_i^1, h_i^2) be i.i.d. copies of (h^1, h^2) for $1 \leq i \leq N$ independent of $\mathcal{G}^1$ and $\mathcal{G}^2$. We consider two mixed even-spin models with Gibbs measures G_N^1 and G_N^2 corresponding to the Hamiltonians $H_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $H_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ as in (1.3),

$$\begin{aligned} H_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= X_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + \sum_{i \leq N} h_i^1 \sigma_i, \\ H_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau}) &= X_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau}) + \sum_{i \leq N} h_i^2 \tau_i, \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

where $X_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $X_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ are defined similarly as (1.4) for $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \Sigma_N$ using $\beta_1, \mathcal{G}^1$ and $\beta_2, \mathcal{G}^2$, respectively. Then the covariances of X_N^1 and X_N^2 can be easily computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1)X_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) &= N\xi_{1,1}(R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)), \\ \mathbb{E}X_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1)X_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau}^2) &= N\xi_{2,2}(R(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^2)), \\ \mathbb{E}X_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1)X_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1) &= N\xi_{1,2}(R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^1)), \end{aligned}$$

for $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2, \boldsymbol{\tau}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^2 \in \Sigma_N$, where

$$\xi_{1,1}(x) = \sum_{p \geq 1} \beta_{1,p}^2 x^{2p}, \quad \xi_{2,2}(x) = \sum_{p \geq 1} \beta_{2,p}^2 x^{2p}, \quad \xi_{1,2}(x) = \sum_{p \geq 1} t_p \beta_{1,p} \beta_{2,p} x^{2p}. \tag{1.7}$$

We will denote by $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\ell, \boldsymbol{\tau}^\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$ an i.i.d. sequence of replicas from the measure $G_N^1 \times G_N^2$ and by $\langle \cdot \rangle$ the Gibbs average with respect to $(G_N^1 \times G_N^2)^{\otimes \infty}$. One may regard the pair of Gibbs measures (G_N^1, G_N^2) as (G_N, G'_N) mentioned above.

Now we present our main results. The first one is concerned with chaos in temperature, namely, the behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ between two systems G_N^1 and G_N^2 at different temperatures β_1 and β_2 . For $j = 1, 2$, let

$$\mathcal{I}_j = \{p \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_{j,p} \neq 0\}.$$

We introduce a family of subsets of natural numbers,

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \{\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \text{linear span of } 1 \text{ and } (x^{2p})_{p \in \mathcal{I}} \text{ is dense in } (C[0, 1], \|\cdot\|_\infty)\}.$$

Note that the Müntz-Szasz theorem (see Theorem 15.26 [14]) provides a very simple criterion: $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ if and only if $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{I}} 1/p = \infty$. Define the following mild conditions on the temperature parameters β_1 and β_2 :

- (C_1) There exist $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_1$ and $p_0 \in \mathcal{I}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and for some $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\beta_{2,p} = \nu\beta_{1,p}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\beta_{2,p_0} \neq \nu\beta_{1,p_0}$,
- (C_2) There exist $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_2$ and $p_0 \in \mathcal{I}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and for some $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\beta_{1,p} = \nu\beta_{2,p}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\beta_{1,p_0} \neq \nu\beta_{2,p_0}$.

Two important examples of β_1 and β_2 satisfying both conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are that we add higher order spin interactions to the SK models and perturb either the SK temperatures or the higher order spin interaction temperatures at the same rate:

Example 1. $\beta_{1,p}, \beta_{2,p} \neq 0$ for all $p \geq 1$ with $\beta_{1,1} \neq \beta_{2,1}$ and $\beta_{1,p} = \beta_{2,p}$ for all $p \geq 2$.

Example 2. $\beta_{1,p}, \beta_{2,p} \neq 0$ for all $p \geq 1$ with $\beta_{1,1} = \beta_{2,1}$ and for some $\nu \neq 1$, $\beta_{1,p} = \nu\beta_{2,p}$ for all $p \geq 2$.

Theorem 1 (Temperature chaos). *Let h^1 and h^2 be jointly Gaussian. Suppose that $t_p = 1$ for all $p \geq 1$ and that $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ satisfy (C_1) and (C_2), respectively. If $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 = 0$ for $j = 1$ or 2 , then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| > \varepsilon) \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then there exists some constant u_f such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) - u_f| > \varepsilon) \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \quad (1.9)$$

Theorem 1 is the first rigorous chaos result in temperature in the mixed even-spin model. It indicates the sensitivity of the model to the change of temperatures. However, due to technical reasons, it remains unknown how to verify (1.8) and (1.9) in the setting of the SK model, i.e. $\beta_{1,1} \neq \beta_{2,1}$ and $\beta_{1,p} = \beta_{2,p} = 0$ for all $p \geq 2$, which seems by far the most interesting case to physicists. Let us remark that the constant u_f in Theorem 1 as well as in Theorems 2 and 3 below could possibly be equal to zero. For instance, as one will see in Proposition 3, if h^1 and h^2 are independent and symmetric with respect to the origin, then $u_f = 0$. The determination of u_f is a highly technical issue. It is indeed the unique fixed point of a function related to Parisi' formula and measures that will be discussed in Section 4.

Next, let us turn to our main results on chaos in disorder. In this problem, we want to know the behavior of the overlap in the coupled system occurred by the change of the disorders. The first rigorous study of this problem without external field was given in [3] and later more general situations of the models with external fields were handled in [4]. In view of the arguments therein, for technical purposes, the Hamiltonians for the two systems are assumed to be identically distributed. We prove that chaos in disorder is still valid even when two Hamiltonians do not have the same distribution if some mild conditions on the temperature parameters are added. The following is our main result.

Theorem 2 (Disorder chaos). *Let h^1 and h^2 be jointly centered Gaussian r.v.. Suppose that $0 \leq t_p < 1$ for some $p \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$. If $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for $j = 1$ or 2 , then (1.8) holds. If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then (1.9) holds.*

Lastly, suppose that the two systems use the same temperature parameters and disorders, i.e. $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ and $t_p = 1$ for all $p \geq 1$. We would like to know how the overlap $R(\sigma, \tau)$ in the coupled system is influenced when the external fields h^1 and h^2 are essentially different from each other. To begin with, let us give a counterexample to illustrate that the chaotic property does not always hold for arbitrary choices of h^1 and h^2 . For instance, one may consider h^1 and h^2 having the relation $h^1 = -h^2$. Since $\xi_{1,1} = \xi_{2,2} = \xi_{1,2}$ is even, one may check easily that

$$(X_N^1(\sigma) + X_N^2(\tau) : \sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_N)$$

and

$$(X_N^1(\sigma) + X_N^2(-\tau) : \sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_N)$$

have the same joint distribution. Thus, using $h^1 = -h^2$ and change of variables $-\tau \rightarrow \tau$, for every Borel measurable subset A of $[-1, 1]$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}G_N^1 \times G_N^2(\{(\sigma, \tau) : R(\sigma, \tau) \in A\}) = \mathbb{E}G_N^1 \times G_N^1(\{(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) : R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \in -A\}),$$

where $-A := \{-x : x \in A\}$. As we have mentioned before, since the limiting distribution of the overlap under $\mathbb{E}G_N^1 \times G_N^1$ is nontrivial in the low temperature regime, we can not witness chaos in this case. Thus, in order to capture the chaotic feature, further assumptions on the external fields are required. Our theorem below provides one possible choice of h^1 and h^2 by assuming that they are different in disorder.

Theorem 3 (External field chaos). *Suppose that $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ and $t_p = 1$ for all $p \geq 1$. Let h^1 and h^2 be two r.v. having the same distribution. If $\mathbb{E}(h^1 \pm h^2)^2 \neq 0$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some positive constant K independent of N such that for all $N \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\sigma, \tau) - u_f| \geq \varepsilon) \rangle < K \exp\left(-\frac{N}{K}\right) \quad (1.10)$$

for some constant u_f .

Apparently, (1.10) is much stronger a chaos result comparing to those in Theorems 1 and 2. The main reason will be illustrated in our proof sketches for which we are going to

discuss now. This paper is mainly motivated by two recent works [4] and [5]. We consider the coupled free energy,

$$p_{N,u} := \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log \sum_{R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})=u} \exp(H_N^1(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + H_N^2(\boldsymbol{\tau})) \quad (1.11)$$

for $u \in S_N := \{i/N : -N \leq i \leq N\}$ and analyze this quantity via an extended Guerra replica symmetry breaking bound. Suppose that μ_P^1 and μ_P^2 are the Parisi measures (see Definition 2 below) corresponding to the two systems, respectively. Set $c_1 = \min \text{supp} \mu_P^1$ and $c_2 = \min \text{supp} \mu_P^2$. We show that this bound naturally gives rise to a function that determines u_f and implies the statement that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $\varepsilon^* > 0$ such that if N is sufficiently large, then

$$p_{N,u} \leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N^1 + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N^2 - \varepsilon^* \quad (1.12)$$

for all $u \in S_N$ with $|u| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}$ and $|u - u_f| \geq \varepsilon$, where $v_1 > c_1$ and $v_2 > c_2$ are two constants independent of N and Z_N^1 and Z_N^2 are the partition functions of the two systems. From this, a standard application of concentration of measure for disorders $\mathcal{G}^1, \mathcal{G}^2$ and external fields $(h_i^1)_{1 \leq i \leq N}, (h_i^2)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ means

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}, |R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) - u_f| \geq \varepsilon) \rangle \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{N}{K}\right) \quad (1.13)$$

for all $N \geq 1$, where $K > 0$ is a constant independent of N . One would like to expect that using appropriate choices of parameters for Guerra's bound also implies (1.12) for all $u \in S_N$ with $|u| \geq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}$ and again from concentration of measure,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| \geq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}) \rangle \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{N}{K}\right) \quad (1.14)$$

for all $N \geq 1$. This together with (1.13) will then yield an exponential bound as (1.10). It turns out that (1.14) can be successfully carried out and will be our main approach to the problem of chaos in external field as in Theorem 3, which relies heavily on the fact that the Hamiltonians in the two systems are identically distributed. Unfortunately, in the setting chaos in temperature or disorder, this fact is generally not valid that creates highly intractable difficulties of choosing parameters in Guerra's bound. To resolve this technical issue, we will adapt another approach [5] by considering the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities and developing a new family of identities for the coupled system under the mild assumptions on the temperature parameters and disorders. These two families of identities contain the information about how the spin configurations between two systems interact with each other that allows us to control the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ between the two systems by using the overlaps $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ and $R(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^2)$ from the individual systems. Ultimately they lead to a weak result,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| \geq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}) \rangle = 0.$$

This and (1.13) together imply the conclusions of Theorems 1 and 2.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to studying some basic properties of Parisi's measures that are needed in our chaos results. In particular, we prove that in the absence of external field, the supports of Parisi's measures always contain the origin for all temperatures. The central proof of this result is played by a fundamental fixed point theorem that will be used later to determine the constant u_f in Section 4. Section 3 begins by recalling the extended Guerra's replica symmetry breaking bound for the coupled free energy (1.11). We will choose parameters for this bound to derive a manageable bound for the coupled free energy in terms of a function ϕ_{v_1, v_2} as in (4.1) below and the Parisi formulas for the two systems. In Section 4, we will investigate the behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ inside the interval $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$. The argument relies on the fixed point theorem established in Section 2 that allow us to determine u_f and to derive an exponentially tail control (1.13). In Section 5, we demonstrate how to use the given conditions in Theorems 1 and 2 to derive the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities and a new family of identities for the coupled system. They together with an application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality provide an approach to controlling the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ via $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ and $R(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^2)$. Finally, we combine all results in every section to prove Theorems 1, 2, and 3 in Section 6.

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank Antonio Auffinger for his careful reading and several suggestions regarding the presentation of the paper.

2 Properties of Parisi's measures

The Parisi formula and measures are intimately related to the investigation of chaos problem as they will induce a crucial function that determines the location at where the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ in the coupled system is concentrated, see Sections 3 and 4 below. In this section, we will recall their definitions and study the support of the Parisi measures.

2.1 Parisi's formula and measures

For given temperature β and external field h , recall the Gibbs measure G_N and partition function Z_N from (1.5). In statistical physics, the thermodynamic limit of the free energy

$$p_N := \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N$$

is one of the most important quantities that describes the macroscopic behavior of the system. It can be computed by the famous Parisi formula described below. For any given integer $k \geq 0$, let $\mathbf{m} = (m_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+1}$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+2}$ be real numbers satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 = 0 &\leq m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_k \leq m_{k+1} = 1, \\ q_0 = 0 &\leq q_1 \leq \cdots \leq q_{k+1} \leq q_{k+2} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

One may think of this triplet $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ as a probability measure μ on $[0, 1]$ that has all of its masses concentrated at a finite number of points $q_1, \dots, q_{k+1}$ and $\mu([0, q_p]) = m_p$

for $0 \leq p \leq k+1$. Let $z_0, \dots, z_{k+1}$ be independent centered Gaussian r.v. with $\mathbb{E}z_p^2 = \xi'(q_{p+1}) - \xi'(q_p)$ for $0 \leq p \leq k+1$. Starting with

$$X_{k+2} = \log \cosh \left(h + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq k+1} z_p \right),$$

we define decreasingly for $1 \leq p \leq k+1$,

$$X_p = \frac{1}{m_p} \log \mathbb{E}_p \exp m_p X_{p+1},$$

where $\mathbb{E}_p$ means the expectation on the r.v. $z_p, z_{p+1}, \dots, z_{k+1}$. If $m_p = 0$ for some p , we define $X_p = \mathbb{E}_p X_{p+1}$. Finally, we define $X_0 = \mathbb{E}X_1$. Set

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) = \log 2 + X_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^{k+1} m_p (\theta(q_{p+1}) - \theta(q_p)), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\theta(x) := x\xi'(x) - \xi(x)$. The importance of this quantity lies on the fact that it yields Guerra's bound for the free energy [8],

$$p_N \leq \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \quad (2.3)$$

for any given triplet $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$. Usually, we call $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ the replica symmetry bound if $k = 0$ and the k -th level replica symmetry breaking bound if $k \geq 1$. Set

$$\mathcal{P}(\xi, h) = \inf_{(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})} \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}), \quad (2.4)$$

where the infimum is taken over all triplets. The Parisi formula states that the thermodynamic limit of the free energy is given by the variational formula (2.4),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \mathcal{P}(\xi, h).$$

This formula is first rigorously verified in [16]. Let us define a functional $\mathcal{P}(\xi, h, \cdot)$ on the space of all probability measures on $[0, 1]$, that are consisted of a finite number of jumps, by letting $\mathcal{P}(\xi, h, \mu) = \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ if μ corresponds to the triplet $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$. It is well-known [8] that this functional is Lipschitz continuous with respect the metric $d(\mu, \mu') = \int_0^1 |\mu([0, x]) - \mu'([0, x])| dx$. Thus, we can extend $\mathcal{P}(\xi, h, \cdot)$ continuously to the space of all probability measures on $[0, 1]$ and for simplicity, we will still denote this extension by $\mathcal{P}(\xi, h, \cdot)$. This then allows us to replace the infimum in the Parisi formula by taking minimum over all probability measures on $[0, 1]$.

Definition 1. Let μ be a probability measure corresponding to the triplet $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we say that μ satisfies condition $MIN(\varepsilon)$ if the following occurs. First, the sequences $\mathbf{m} = (m_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+1}$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+2}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 &= 0 < m_1 < \dots < m_k < m_{k+1} = 1 \\ q_0 &= 0 \leq q_1 < \dots < q_{k+1} < q_{k+2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \leq \mathcal{P}(\xi, h) + \varepsilon$$

and

$\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ realizes the minimum of $\mathcal{P}_k$ over all choices of $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{q}$.

Let us remark that for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, one can always find a $\mu \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$ by Lemma 14.5.5 and Proposition 14.7.5 in [18]. In addition, if $\mathbb{E}h^2 \neq 0$, then one further has $q_1 > 0$. As one might expect, there may have several minimizers to Parisi's formula. Among possibly many minimizers, we are particularly interested in those, called the Parisi measures μ_P defined below.

Definition 2. A probability measure μ_P is called a Parisi measure (corresponding to the function ξ and external field h) if it is the weak limit of a sequence of probability measures $\mu_n \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon_n)$ for some sequence of real numbers $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$.

In physics, it is conjectured that the Parisi measure is unique and it is the limiting distribution of the overlap. Under suitable technical assumption on β , such as $\beta_p \neq 0$ for all $p \geq 1$, these statements are verified to be valid, but the general situation remains open.

There are two basic properties about the Parisi measures and the overlap that are of great importance and are intimately related to the study of chaos phenomena. First, in the presence of external field, $\mathbb{E}h^2 \neq 0$, they satisfy a positivity principle, namely, for any Parisi measure μ_P , we have that

$$c := \inf \text{supp} \mu_P > 0 \tag{2.5}$$

and for all $c' < c$,

$$\mathbb{E}G_N \times G_N(\{(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) : R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \leq c'\}) \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{N}{K}\right) \tag{2.6}$$

for all $N \geq 1$, where K is a positive constant independent of N . This result can be found in Section 14.12 [18]. The second property is concerned with their behavior in the absence of external field, $\mathbb{E}h^2 = 0$. It is believed according to physicists' numerical simulations [10] that in this case the origin is contained in the support of the limiting distribution of the overlap. It turns out that mathematically there are several approaches to verify this observation in the high temperature regime (see Chapter 1 [18]) but it is by no means clear how to attack this problem in the low temperature regime. In this paper, we prove that at least this observation is true for the Parisi measures. Below is the statement of our main result.

Theorem 4. For any β , if $\mathbb{E}h^2 = 0$, then $0 \in \text{supp} \mu_P$ for every Parisi measure μ_P .

Although in this paper Theorem 4 will only be used to derive our chaos results, it is also of independent interest in understanding the structure of the pure states of the Gibbs measure. Let us remark that in the spherical Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model without external field [12], the Parisi measure consists of a single point mass at some $c > 0$, which is very different to our result in Theorem 4.

2.2 An auxiliary function and a fixed point theorem

The central rhythm of the proof for Theorem 4 and our results on chaos are played by an auxiliary function and a fixed point theorem given below. Suppose that μ is a probability measure corresponding to some $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$. Recall X_0 from (2.2) by using this triplet. A very nice property about this quantity says that it can also be computed as $\mathbb{E}\Phi_\mu(h, 0)$, where $\Phi_\mu : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the solution to the following PDE,

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_\mu}{\partial q} = -\frac{\xi''(q)}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_\mu}{\partial x^2} + \mu([0, q]) \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_\mu}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right) \quad (2.7)$$

with $\Phi_\mu(x, 1) = \log \cosh x$. Let μ_P be a Parisi measure and $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be any sequence of probability measures consisted of a finite number of point masses that converges weakly to μ_P . Let Φ_{μ_n} be the PDE solution (2.7) associated to μ_n . From the Lipschitz property of the Parisi functional, one sees that $(\Phi_{\mu_n})_{n \geq 1}$ converges uniformly on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$. Define

$$\Phi_{\mu_P} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{\mu_n}. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that from the Lipschitz property of the Parisi function, Φ_{μ_P} is indeed independent of the choice of the sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Let us summarize some further properties about Φ_{μ_P} that will be used throughout the paper in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *The following facts hold for Φ_{μ_P} .*

- (a) For $0 \leq j \leq 3$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial^j \Phi_{\mu_n}}{\partial x^j} = \frac{\partial^j \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^j}$ uniformly on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$.
- (b) $\|\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}\|_\infty \leq 1$, $0 \leq \inf_x \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^2} < \|\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^2}\|_\infty \leq 1$, and $\|\frac{\partial^3 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^3}\|_\infty \leq 4$.
- (c) $\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, q)$ is odd for any q .
- (d) If $\mathbb{E}h^2 \neq 0$, recalling from (2.5), we have that $c > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h + \chi, c) \right)^2 &= c, \\ \xi''(c) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^2}(h + \chi, c) \right)^2 &\leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where χ is centered Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}\chi^2 = \xi'(c)$ and is independent of h .

Proof. The proofs for $j = 0, 1$ in the first statement are given in the proof of Theorem 3.2 [17]. One may see that indeed a similar but much more tedious argument as Theorem 3.2 [17] will also yield the cases for $j = 2, 3$. The second and third assertions are concluded from Lemma 14.7.16 [18] and Lemma 2 [4]. Finally, the fourth statement is exactly Lemma 12 [4]. □

Recall $\xi_{1,1}$, $\xi_{2,2}$, and $\xi_{1,2}$ from (1.7). Let us note that the two sequences β_1 and β_2 in the definitions of $\xi_{1,1}$ and $\xi_{2,2}$ are nontrivial. Below is our fixed point theorem.

Theorem 5. Let c_1, c_2 be any two numbers satisfying $0 < c_1, c_2 \leq 1$ and h^1, h^2 be any two r.v. Suppose that F_1, F_2 are real-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\|F_j'\|_\infty, \|F_j''\|_\infty < \infty$ and $0 \leq \inf F_j' < \|F_j'\|_\infty < \infty$ for $j = 1, 2$. Define

$$F(u) = \mathbb{E}F_1(h^1 + \chi^1)F_2(h^2 + \chi^2) \quad (2.9)$$

for $|u| \leq \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$, where χ^1, χ^2 are jointly centered Gaussian independent of h^1, h^2 with $\mathbb{E}(\chi^1)^2 = \xi'_{1,1}(c_1)$, $\mathbb{E}(\chi^2)^2 = \xi'_{2,2}(c_2)$, and $\mathbb{E}\chi^1\chi^2 = \xi'_{1,2}(u)$. If

$$\mathbb{E}F_j(h^j + \chi^j)^2 = c_j, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\xi''_{j,j}(c_j)\mathbb{E}F_j'(h^j + \chi^j)^2 \leq 1, \quad (2.11)$$

then F maps $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$ to itself and F has a unique fixed point u_f .

Proof. Note that from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, $|\xi'_{1,2}(u)| \leq \xi'_{1,1}(c_1)^{1/2}\xi'_{2,2}(c_2)^{1/2}$ whenever $|u| \leq \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$. So F is well-defined. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality again and (2.10) yield that F maps $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$ to itself. By the virtue of Banach's fixed point theorem, to prove that F has a unique fixed point, it suffices to show that $|F'(u)| < 1$ for all $|u| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$. Note that from the nontriviality of β_1 and β_2 , $\xi'_{1,1}(c_1), \xi''_{1,1}(c_1), \xi'_{2,2}(c_2), \xi''_{2,2}(c_2) > 0$. Now we write

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^1 &= \sqrt{\xi'_{1,1}(c_1)}(\sqrt{\eta(u)}w + \sqrt{1 - \eta(u)}w_1), \\ \chi^2 &= \sqrt{\xi'_{2,2}(c_2)}(\text{sign}(u)\sqrt{\eta(u)}w + \sqrt{1 - \eta(u)}w_2), \end{aligned}$$

where w, w_1, w_2 are i.i.d. standard Gaussian and $\eta(u) = \xi'_{1,2}(|u|)/\xi'_{1,1}(c_1)^{1/2}\xi'_{2,2}(c_2)^{1/2}$. A direct computation using Gaussian integration by parts together with the uniform boundedness of the first and second partial derivatives of F_1 and F_2 leads to

$$F'(u) = \xi''_{1,2}(u)\mathbb{E}F_1'(h^1 + \chi^1)F_2'(h^2 + \chi^2), \quad |u| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}.$$

Note that $\xi''_{1,2}$ is an even function and from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, $\xi''_{1,2}(u) \leq \xi''_{1,1}(c_1)^{1/2}\xi''_{2,2}(c_2)^{1/2}$ for $|u| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$. This and (2.11) together with another application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality imply that for all $|u| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$,

$$|F'(u)| = \frac{\xi''_{1,2}(u)}{\xi''_{1,1}(c_1)^{1/2}\xi''_{2,2}(c_2)^{1/2}}\mathbb{E}Z_1Z_2 \leq \mathbb{E}Z_1Z_2 \leq (\mathbb{E}Z_1^2)^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}Z_2^2)^{1/2} \leq 1 \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$Z_1 := \xi''_{1,1}(c_1)^{1/2}F_1'(h^1 + \chi^1) \text{ and } Z_2 := \xi''_{2,2}(c_2)^{1/2}F_2'(h^2 + \chi^2).$$

If $|F'(u_0)| = 1$ for some $|u_0| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$, then (2.12) implies $\mathbb{E}Z_1Z_2 = 1$. Thus, from (2.11),

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_1 - Z_2)^2 = \mathbb{E}Z_1^2 + \mathbb{E}Z_2^2 - 2\mathbb{E}Z_1Z_2 \leq 2 - 2 = 0$$

and so $Z_1 = Z_2$. Now, on the one hand, since $\eta(u_0) < 1$ and $\xi'_{1,1}(c_1), \xi'_{2,2}(c_2) > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(h^1 + \chi^1 \in O_1, h^2 + \chi^2 \in O_2) > 0$ for all open subsets O_1, O_2 . On the other hand, from $\inf F_j' < \sup F_j'$, F_j' is not a constant function. These two facts together with $\xi''_{1,1}(c_1), \xi''_{2,2}(c_2) > 0$ imply that $Z_1 \neq Z_2$ has nonzero probability, a contradiction. So $|F'(u)| < 1$ for all $|u| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$ and this completes our proof. $\square$

2.3 Proof of Theorem 4

To motivate our approach, we will first consider the case that μ_P is a replica symmetry solution to the Parisi formula, i.e. $\mu_P(\{c\}) = 1$ for some $0 \leq c \leq 1$. We then continue to study the case that μ_P is a replica symmetry breaking solution, i.e. μ_P is nontrivial. As one shall see, the argument for the second case is exactly the same as that presented in the first case. Only now added complications resulting from the more complicated structure of μ_P has to be treated subtly.

Proof of Theorem 4 for replica symmetric μ_P : Assume that $\mu_P(\{c\}) = 1$ for some $c \in [0, 1]$. Suppose on the contrary that $0 < c \leq 1$. Recall the Parisi functional $\mathcal{P}_0(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ from (2.2), where $\mathbf{m} = (0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{q} = (0, q, 1)$ for $0 \leq q \leq 1$. First, observe that

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_0}{dq}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\xi''(q)(q - \mathbb{E} \tanh^2(w\sqrt{\xi(q)}))$$

and this function is > 0 at $q = 1$, where w is standard Gaussian. We conclude that $c < 1$ and thus, c satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \tanh^2 Y = c, \tag{2.13}$$

where $Y := w\xi'(c)^{1/2}$. Next, recall a well-known result of Toninelli [19], which says that above the Almeida-Thouless line, i.e. $\xi''(c)\mathbb{E} \cosh^{-4} Y > 1$, the Parisi measure could not be replica symmetric. Let us notice that although Toninelli's original theorem is dedicated to the SK model, one may find that indeed a similar argument as [19] or Section 13.2 [18] will yield Toninelli's theorem in the mixed even-spin model. Thus, we obtain

$$\xi''(c)\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\cosh^4 Y} \leq 1. \tag{2.14}$$

Now consider the PDE solution Φ_{μ_P} corresponding to μ_P from (2.7),

$$\Phi_{\mu_P}(x, c) = \log \cosh x + \frac{1}{2}(\xi'(1) - \xi'(c)).$$

Let $\xi_{1,1} = \xi_{2,2} = \xi_{1,2} = \xi$, $F_1 = F_2 = \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c) = \tanh$, $h^1 = h^2 = 0$, and $c_1 = c_2 = c$ in Theorem 5. From (2.13) and (2.14), F_1 and F_2 obviously satisfy (2.10) and (2.11). Therefore, the function F defined from (2.9) must have a unique solution. However, since F_1 and F_2 are odd functions, one may see clearly that 0 and $-c$ are also fixed points of F , a contradiction. So $c = 0$ and this completes the argument of the case that μ_P is replica symmetric. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4 for replica symmetric breaking μ_P : Assume now that μ_P is nontrivial and $c = \min \text{supp} \mu_P > 0$. Note that since μ_P is not replica symmetric, we can further assume $0 < c < 1$. Recall Φ_{μ_P} from (2.8). One would like to expect that similar results as (2.13) and (2.14) also hold for Φ_{μ_P} such that one can apply Theorem 5 to conclude Theorem 4. It turns out that under the assumption $c > 0$, we have the

following,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\chi, c) \right)^2 = c, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\xi''(c) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^2}(\chi, c) \right)^2 \leq 1, \quad (2.16)$$

where χ denotes the centered Gaussian r.v. with $\mathbb{E}\chi^2 = \xi'(c)$. Suppose for the moment that (2.15) and (2.16) hold (They will be verified below). From Proposition 5 using $\xi_{1,1} = \xi_{2,2} = \xi_{1,2} = \xi$, $F_1 = F_2 = \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c)$, $h^1 = h^2 = 0$, and $c_1 = c_2 = c$, the function F defined at (2.9) has a unique fixed point, but this contradicts to the fact that 0 and $-c$ are also the fixed points of F since $\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c)$ is odd from (c) in Proposition 1. Therefore, c has to be zero, which finishes the proof of Theorem 4. $\square$

The rest of this subsection is devoted to the derivation of (2.15) and (2.16) assuming $c > 0$. The basic idea is to study the local stability of the Parisi solution μ_P in the Parisi formula as performed in (2.13) and in Chapter 14 [18]. Suppose that $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ is a triplet corresponding to a measure μ . Recall $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ from (2.2). Since we will be differentiating this quantity with respect to q_p 's and m_p 's and the definition of X_0 in $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ involves an iteration scheme, for convenience, we define a sequence of functions $(A_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+2}$ as follows. Let $(z_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+1}$ be independent centered Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}z_p^2 = \xi'(q_{p+1}) - \xi'(q_p)$. Starting from $A_{k+2}(x) = \log \cosh x$, we define decreasingly for $0 \leq p \leq k+1$,

$$A_p(x) = \frac{1}{m_p} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m_p A_{p+1}(x + z_p), \quad (2.17)$$

where we define $A_p(x) = \mathbb{E}A_{p+1}(x + z_p)$ whenever $m_p = 0$. Note that $X_0 = \mathbb{E}A_0(h)$. Let Φ_μ be the PDE solution (2.7) corresponding to μ . Easy to see $\Phi_\mu(x, 1) = A_{k+2}(x)$ and more importantly, a direction computation using Gaussian integration by parts implies that Φ_μ can be represented in terms of $(A_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+2}$,

$$\Phi_\mu(x, q) = \frac{1}{m_p} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m_p A_{p+1} \left(x + z \sqrt{\xi'(q_{p+1}) - \xi'(q)} \right) \quad (2.18)$$

whenever $q_p \leq q < q_{p+1}$ for some $0 \leq p \leq k+1$, where z is standard Gaussian. In particular, for $0 \leq p \leq k+2$,

$$\Phi_\mu(x, q_p) = A_p(x). \quad (2.19)$$

Set $(\zeta_p)_{1 \leq p \leq k+2}$ by letting

$$\zeta_p = \sum_{0 \leq n < p} z_p$$

and set $(W_p)_{1 \leq p \leq k+1}$ by

$$W_p = \exp m_p (A_{p+1}(\zeta_{p+1}) - A_p(\zeta_p)).$$

Now suppose that $k \geq 1$ and $\mu \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $0 \leq s \leq k+1$ satisfy $q_s \leq c < q_{s+1}$. A study of the local stability of μ in $\mathcal{P}_k$ yields the lemma below.

Lemma 1. Suppose that there exists some $0 < c' < c$ such that $c' > \varepsilon^{1/6}$. If $q_s > c'$, then

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{s-1} A'_s(\zeta_s)^2 = q_s, \quad (2.20)$$

$$\xi''(q_s) \mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{s-1} A''_s(\zeta_s)^2 \leq 1 + M\varepsilon^{1/6}, \quad (2.21)$$

where $M > 0$ depends only on ξ and c' . If $q_{s+1} < 1$, then

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_s A'_{s+1}(\zeta_{s+1})^2 = q_{s+1}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$\xi''(q_{s+1}) \mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_s A''_{s+1}(\zeta_{s+1})^2 \leq 1 + M\varepsilon^{1/6}, \quad (2.23)$$

where $M > 0$ depends only on ξ and c .

Proof. To obtain (2.20) and (2.22), suppose for the moment that one thinks of $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ as a function defined on the space of all vectors $(m_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+1}$ and $(q_p)_{0 \leq p \leq k+2}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 &= 0 < m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_k < m_{k+1} = 1, \\ q_0 &= 0 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_{k+1} < q_{k+2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

If $q_1 = 0$, a direct differentiation of $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ with respect to q_r for $2 \leq r \leq k+1$ implies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_r} \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2}(m_r - m_{r-1})\xi''(q_r)(-\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{r-1} A'_r(\zeta_r)^2 + q_r); \quad (2.24)$$

if $q_1 > 0$, then (2.24) also holds for $r = 1$. For the detailed computation, one may refer to Proposition 14.7.5 in [18]. Since $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$, it implies that $\frac{\partial}{\partial q_s} \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) = 0$ for either $r \geq 2$ or $r = 1$ with $q_1 > 0$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{r-1} A'_r(\zeta_r)^2 = q_r \quad (2.25)$$

for either $r \geq 2$ or $r = 1$ with $q_1 > 0$. In particular, if the condition $q_s > c'$ holds, then $1 \leq s \leq k+1$ and so (2.20) holds from (2.25) with $r = s$; if $q_{s+1} < 1$, then $1 \leq s+1 \leq k+1$ and since $q_{s+1} > c$, using (2.25) with $r = s+1$ implies (2.22).

For (2.21) and (2.23), recall that the triplet $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 &= 0 < m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_k < m_{k+1} = 1, \\ q_0 &= 0 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_{k+1} < q_{k+2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Consider new lists of sequences, for $1 \leq r \leq k+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(m) &= (0, m_1, \dots, m_{r-1}, m, m_r, \dots, m_k, 1), \\ \mathbf{q}(u) &= (0, q_1, \dots, q_{r-1}, u, q_r, \dots, q_{k+1}, 1), \end{aligned}$$

with $m_{r-1} \leq m \leq m_r$ and $q_{r-1} \leq u \leq q_r$. For $1 \leq r \leq k+1$, we define

$$f_r(u) = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(\mathbf{m}(m), \mathbf{q}(u)) \right|_{m=m_{r-1}}$$

Let us observe that from the definition of f and $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$,

$$f_r(q_r) = 0, \forall 1 \leq r \leq k+1, \quad (2.26)$$

$$f_r(q_{r-1}) = 0, \forall 2 \leq r \leq k+1. \quad (2.27)$$

Here comes the most critical part: there exists a constant $M > 0$ depending only on ξ such that for every $2 \leq r \leq k+1$,

$$f_r(u) \geq -M\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \forall q_{r-1} \leq u \leq q_r, \quad (2.28)$$

$$f'_r(q_r) = -\frac{1}{2}\xi''(q_r) (\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{r-1}A'_r(\zeta_r)^2 - q_r), \quad (2.29)$$

$$f''_r(q_r) = -\frac{1}{2}\xi''(q_r) (\xi''(q_r)\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{r-1}A''_r(\zeta_r)^2 - 1) \quad (2.30)$$

and if $q_1 > 0$, these also hold for $r = 1$. In addition, for $1 \leq r \leq k+1$,

$$\max_{q_{r-1} \leq m \leq q_r} |f'''_r(u)| \leq M. \quad (2.31)$$

The inequality (2.28) is mainly due to $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon)$, while (2.29), (2.30), and (2.31) are based on a series of applications of the Gaussian integration by parts formula. Again, since they have been carried out in great detail in Section 14.7 [18], we will omit the derivation of these results. Now, using Taylor's formula together with (2.25), (2.26), (2.29), and (2.31), if either $r \geq 2$ or $r = 1$ with $q_1 > 0$, we have

$$f_r(u) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u - q_r)^2 f''_r(q_r) + M|u - q_r|^3. \quad (2.32)$$

Suppose that $q_s > c'$. Then $1 \leq s \leq k+1$. First, we assume

$$u = q_s - \varepsilon^{1/6} \geq q_{s-1}. \quad (2.33)$$

Using (2.28) and (2.32) with $r = s$ yields

$$-M\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{1/3}f''_s(q_s) + M\sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

and this implies from (2.30),

$$-f''_s(q_s) = \frac{1}{2}\xi''(q_s)(\xi''(q_s)\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{s-1}A''_s(\zeta_s)^2 - 1) \leq 4M\varepsilon^{1/6}.$$

Since $\xi''(c') < \xi''(q_s)$, (2.21) clearly follows. Assume now that (2.33) fails. Since $c' > \varepsilon^{1/6}$ and $q_0 = 0$, we have $s \geq 2$. Therefore, the use of (2.27), (2.30), and (2.32) with $r = s$ and $u = q_{s-1}$ leads to

$$-f''_s(q_s) = \frac{1}{2}\xi''(q_s)(\xi''(q_s)\mathbb{E}W_1 \cdots W_{s-1}A''_s(\zeta_s)^2 - 1) \leq 2M(q_s - q_{s-1}) \leq \varepsilon^{1/6}.$$

Again, (2.21) holds from this inequality and using $\xi''(q_s) > \xi''(c')$. Note that $q_{s+1} > c > \varepsilon^{1/6}$ and that $q_{s+1} < 1$ implies $1 \leq s+1 \leq k+1$. One may argue similarly as above to get (2.23). □

Lemma 2. Let $\eta > 0$ and $0 < \delta < c$. Suppose that l and l' are fixed integers with $1 \leq l < l' \leq k+1$. If $m_p \leq \eta$ for every $1 \leq p \leq l-1$, then

$$\mathbb{E}|W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} - 1| \leq M\eta. \quad (2.34)$$

If $c - \delta \leq q_p \leq q_{l'}$ for every $l \leq p \leq l'$, then

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} |W_l W_{l+1} \cdots W_{l'-1} - 1| \leq M\sqrt{q_{l'} - c + \delta}. \quad (2.35)$$

Here, M depends only on ξ .

Proof. Similar arguments as (14.468) and (14.469) in [18] will yield the announced results. $\square$

Recall the definition of the Parisi measure μ_P . It is the weak limit of a sequence of probability measures $\mu_n \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon_n)$ with $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$. For clarity, in the following, we will only use $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ to denote the triplet corresponding to μ_n . One has to keep in mind that this triplet depends on n and ε_n . Note that since μ_P is nontrivial, we may assume $k \geq 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. Let $0 \leq s \leq k+1$ satisfy $q_s \leq c < q_{s+1}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the limits of q_s , q_{s+1} , and m_s exist and they are denoted by c_- , c_+ , and m_c , respectively. Note that if $c_- < c < c_+$, then $c_- < c$ implies $m_c = 0$, but on the other hand, $c < c_+$ implies $\min \text{supp} \mu_P > c$, a contradiction. Therefore, we can further assume that one of the following occurs.

- (i) $c_- = c$ and there is some $0 < c' < c$ such that $q_s > c'$ for all n .
- (ii) $c_+ = c$ and $q_{s+1} < 1$ for all n .

Lemma 3. We have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W_1 \cdots W_{s-1} - 1| = 0. \quad (2.36)$$

If in addition, (ii) occurs, then we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |W_1 \cdots W_s - 1| = 0. \quad (2.37)$$

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < c$ be fixed. Suppose that $1 \leq l \leq s+1$ is the largest integer such that $q_{l-1} \leq c - \delta$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n([0, c - \delta]) = 0$, we have that for any $\eta > 0$, $m_p \leq \eta$ for every $0 \leq l-1$ provided that n is sufficiently large. Since $c - \delta < q_p \leq q_s \leq c < q_{s+1}$ for $l \leq p \leq s$, using (2.35) twice, we get

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} |W_l W_{l+1} \cdots W_{s-1} - 1| \leq M\sqrt{q_s - c + \delta} \leq M\sqrt{\delta}, \quad (2.38)$$

$$\mathbb{E}W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} |W_l W_{l+1} \cdots W_s - 1| \leq M\sqrt{q_{s+1} - c + \delta}. \quad (2.39)$$

From the triangle inequality, (2.34), and (2.38), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{s-1} - 1| &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} |W_l W_{l+1} \cdots W_{s-1} - 1| \\ &\quad + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} - 1| \\ &\leq M\sqrt{\delta} + M\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if (ii) occurs, using the triangle inequality, (2.34), and (2.39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W_1 W_2 \cdots W_s - 1| &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} |W_l W_{l+1} \cdots W_s - 1| \\
&\quad + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W_1 W_2 \cdots W_{l-1} - 1| \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M \sqrt{q_{s+1} - c + \delta} + M\eta \\
&= M\sqrt{\delta} + M\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta, \eta > 0$ are arbitrary small numbers, passing to the limit implies (2.36) and (2.37). $\square$

Now let us proceed to prove (2.15) and (2.16) as follows. Suppose that (i) holds. Then from (2.19), (a) in Proposition 1, (2.20), (2.21), and (2.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\chi, c) \right)^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} A'_s(\zeta_s)^2 \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} W_1 \cdots W_{s-1} A'_s(\zeta_s)^2 \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_s \\
&= c
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi''(c) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x^2}(\chi, c) \right)^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi''(q_s) \mathbb{E} A''_s(\zeta_s)^2 \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi''(q_s) \mathbb{E} W_1 \cdots W_{s-1} A''_s(\zeta_s)^2 \\
&\leq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

If (ii) holds, then we argue similarly by using from (2.19), (a) in Proposition 1, (2.22), (2.23), and (2.37) to conclude (2.15) and (2.16). This completes the argument of our proof.

3 Controlling the coupled free energy

We will recall Guerra's replica symmetry breaking bound for the coupled free energy (1.11). From this, we derive a manageable bound by using suitable chosen parameters. As one shall see, this derivation naturally gives rise to a crucial function that will be used in Section 4 to determine the unique constant u_f as stated in our chaos results and also to control the behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ as (1.13).

3.1 Guerra's bound

Recall the two systems corresponding to the Hamiltonians H_N^1 and H_N^2 in (1.6). We denote by Z_N^1 and Z_N^2 the partition functions, by $\mathcal{P}_{k_1}^1(\mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{k_2}^2(\mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2)$ as in (2.2), and by $\mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h^1)$ and $\mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h^2)$ the variational formulas as in (2.4) associated to the

two systems, respectively. Set $u_{1,1} = u_{2,2} = 1$ and $u_{1,2} = u_{2,1} = u$ for some $-1 \leq u \leq 1$. Recall $\xi_{1,1}$, $\xi_{2,2}$, and $\xi_{1,2}$ from (1.7). Define $\xi_{2,1} = \xi_{1,2}$ and $\theta_{j,j'}(x) = x\xi'_{j,j'}(x) - \xi_{j,j'}(x)$ for $1 \leq j, j' \leq 2$. Let $\kappa \geq 1$ be an integer and let (y_p^1, y_p^2) be jointly centered Gaussian r.v. for $0 \leq p \leq \kappa$ with

$$\mathbb{E}y_p^j y_p^{j'} = \xi'_{j,j'}(\rho_{p+1}^{j,j'}) - \xi'_{j,j'}(\rho_p^{j,j'}), \quad (3.1)$$

where $(\rho_p^{j,j'})_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa+1, 1 \leq j, j' \leq 2}$ are real numbers satisfying $\rho_0^{j,j'} = 0$, $\rho_{\kappa+1}^{j,j'} = u_{j,j'}$ for $1 \leq j, j' \leq 2$. These pairs (y_p^1, y_p^2) are also assumed to be independent of each other. Let $n_0 = 0 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_{\kappa-1} \leq n_\kappa = 1$. The Guerra replica symmetry breaking bound for the coupled free energy is stated as follows.

Theorem 6 (Guerra). *We have*

$$p_{N,u} \leq Y_0(\lambda) - \lambda u - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j' \leq 2} \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa} n_p (\theta_{j,j'}(\rho_{p+1}^{j,j'}) - \theta_{j,j'}(\rho_p^{j,j'})), \quad (3.2)$$

where $Y_0(\lambda)$ is defined as follows. Starting with

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\kappa+1}(\lambda) := & \log \left(\cosh \left(h^1 + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa} y_p^1 \right) \cosh \left(h^2 + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa} y_p^2 \right) \cosh \lambda \right. \\ & \left. + \sinh \left(h^1 + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa} y_p^1 \right) \sinh \left(h^2 + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa} y_p^2 \right) \sinh \lambda \right), \end{aligned}$$

we define decreasingly for $p \geq 1$, $Y_p(\lambda) = n_p^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}_p \exp n_p Y_{p+1}(\lambda)$, where $\mathbb{E}_p$ denotes the expectation in the r.v. y_n^1 and y_n^2 for $n \geq p$. In the case of $n_p = 0$ for some p , we set $Y_p(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_p Y_{p+1}(\lambda)$. Finally, $Y_0(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} Y_1(\lambda)$.

Recalling Guerra's original bound from (2.3), (3.2) is a kind of two dimensional bound for the coupled free energy. Its proof is essentially the same as that of Proposition 14.12.4 [18] and a more generalized version can be found in Section 15.7 [18]. Such bound has played a very fundamental role in Talagrand's original proof for the validity of the Parisi formula [16], where the two systems he considered are exactly the same, i.e. $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, $\mathcal{G}^1 = \mathcal{G}^2$, and $h^1 = h^2$. In our case, since these external parameters may be essentially different, how to find suitable parameters κ , $(n_p)_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa+1}$, $(\rho_p^{j,j'})_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa+1, 1 \leq j, j' \leq 2}$, and λ to control this bound becomes a very intricate issue. To illustrate the main difficulty, note that from the definition (1.11) of $p_{N,u}$ and (2.3), one sees obviously for all $u \in S_N$,

$$p_{N,u} \leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N^1 + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N^2 \leq \mathcal{P}_{k_1}^1(\mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1) + \mathcal{P}_{k_2}^2(\mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2) \quad (3.3)$$

for arbitrary choices of the triplets $(k_1, \mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1)$ and $(k_2, \mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2)$ satisfying (2.1). Thus, if (3.2) is a relevant bound to investigate chaos problems, one should be able to find parameters for (3.2) to recover the inequality (3.3). In the next subsection, one will see that this could be done for all $|u| \leq \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$, but the general case remains unclear.

3.2 a manageable bound

The goal of this subsection is to derive the following bound for the coupled free energy. Denote by $(k_1, \mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1)$ and $(k_2, \mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2)$ two arbitrary triplets corresponding to probability measures μ^1 and μ^2 and by Φ_{1,μ^1} and Φ_{2,μ^2} the PDE solutions (2.7) associated with $\xi_{1,1}, \mu^1$ and $\xi_{2,2}, \mu^2$, respectively. Assume that ι is an integer satisfying $1 \leq \iota \leq \min(k_1, k_2) + 1$.

Proposition 2. *For every $|u| \leq \sqrt{q_l^1 q_l^2}$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} p_{N,u} &\leq \mathcal{P}_{k_1}^1(\mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1) + \mathcal{P}_{k_2}^2(\mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{1,\mu^1}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi^1, q_l^1) \frac{\partial \Phi_{2,\mu^2}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi^2, q_l^2) - u \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=0}^{\iota-1} m_p^1(\theta_{1,1}(q_{p+1}^1) - \theta_{1,1}(q_p^1)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=0}^{\iota-1} m_p^2(\theta_{2,2}(q_{p+1}^2) - \theta_{2,2}(q_p^2)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where χ^1 and χ^2 are jointly centered Gaussian independent of h^1 and h^2 with $\mathbb{E}(\chi^1)^2 = \xi'_{1,1}(q_l^1)$, $\mathbb{E}(\chi^2)^2 = \xi'_{2,2}(q_l^2)$, and $\mathbb{E}\chi^1\chi^2 = \xi'_{1,2}(u)$.

We will need a crucial lemma. Let us keep every parameter but λ in the statement of Theorem 6 fixed. Recall κ , $(n_p)_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa}$, and $(y_p^j)_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa, 1 \leq j \leq 2}$ from the last subsection. Starting with $D_{j,\kappa+1}(x) = \log \cosh x$ for $j = 1, 2$, we define decreasingly for $1 \leq p \leq \kappa$ and $j = 1, 2$ by

$$D_{j,p}(x) = \frac{1}{n_p} \log \mathbb{E}_p \exp n_p D_{j,p+1}(x + y_p^j).$$

As usual, we define $D_{j,p}(x) = \mathbb{E}_p D_{j,p+1}(x + y_p^j)$ when $n_p = 0$.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that $(y_p^1)_{1 \leq p \leq \kappa}$ and $(y_p^2)_{1 \leq p \leq \kappa}$ are independent of each other. Then*

$$Y_0(0) = \mathbb{E} D_{1,1}(h^1 + y_0^1) + \mathbb{E} D_{2,1}(h^2 + y_0^2), \quad (3.5)$$

$$Y'_0(0) = \mathbb{E} D'_{1,1}(h^1 + y_0^1) D'_{2,1}(h^2 + y_0^2). \quad (3.6)$$

For the second derivative of Y_0 , we have for every λ ,

$$0 \leq Y''_0(\lambda) \leq 1. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. The proofs for (3.5) and (3.6) are exactly the same as the arguments in Proposition 14.6.4 [18], while the statement (3.7) can also be obtained from a similar argument as Lemma 14.6.5 [18]. □

Similar to (2.17), we define two sequences of functions $(A_{1,p})_{0 \leq p \leq k_1+2}$ and $(A_{2,p})_{0 \leq p \leq k_2+2}$ as follows. For $j = 1, 2$, suppose that $(z_p^j)_{0 \leq p \leq k_j+1}$ are independent centered Gaussian r.v. with $\mathbb{E}(z_p^j)^2 = \xi'_{j,j}(q_{p+1}^j) - \xi'_{j,j}(q_p^j)$. Starting with $A_{j,k_j+2}(x) = \log \cosh x$, we define decreasingly

$$A_{j,p}(x) = \frac{1}{m_p^j} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m_p^j A_{j,p+1}(x + z_p^j)$$

for $0 \leq p \leq k_j + 1$, where we let $A_{j,p}(x) = \mathbb{E}A_{j,p+1}(x + z_p^j)$ when $m_p^j = 0$.

Proof of Proposition 2: Our proof is based on Guerra's bound with special choices of the parameters κ , $(n_p)_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa}$, $(\rho_p^{j,j'})_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa+1, 1 \leq j, j' \leq 2}$, and λ that will be specified below. Without loss of generality, we assume that $m_\iota^1 \leq m_\iota^2$. Define $I_a = \{n : m_{\iota+a-1}^1 \leq m_n^2 < m_{\iota+a}^1\}$ for each $1 \leq a \leq k_1 - \iota$ and $I_{k_1-\iota+1} = \{n : m_{k_1}^1 \leq m_n^2 \leq m_{k_1+1}^1 = 1\}$. Set for $1 \leq a \leq k_1 - \iota + 2$,

$$s(a) = 2a - 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{a-1} |I_n|,$$

$$t(a) = \iota + \sum_{n=1}^{a-1} |I_n|.$$

Here, $|I|$ stands for the total number of elements in I for any given finite set I . Set $(\rho_0^{1,1}, \rho_0^{2,2}, n_0) = (0, 0, 0)$. For each $1 \leq a \leq k_1 - \iota + 1$, we set the following numbers

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{s(a)}^{1,1}, \rho_{s(a)}^{2,2}, n_{s(a)}) &= (q_{\iota+a-1}^1, q_{t(a)}^2, m_{\iota+a-1}^1), \\ (\rho_{s(a)+1}^{1,1}, \rho_{s(a)+1}^{2,2}, n_{s(a)+1}) &= (q_{\iota+a}^1, q_{t(a)}^2, m_{t(a)}^2), \\ (\rho_{s(a)+2}^{1,1}, \rho_{s(a)+2}^{2,2}, n_{s(a)+2}) &= (q_{\iota+a}^1, q_{t(a)+1}^2, m_{t(a)+1}^2), \\ &\vdots \\ (\rho_{s(a)+|I_a|}^{1,1}, \rho_{s(a)+|I_a|}^{2,2}, n_{s(a)+|I_a|}) &= (q_{\iota+a}^1, q_{t(a)+|I_a|-1}^2, m_{t(a)+|I_a|-1}^2), \\ (\rho_{s(a)+|I_a|+1}^{1,1}, \rho_{s(a)+|I_a|+1}^{2,2}, n_{s(a)+|I_a|+1}) &= (q_{\iota+a}^1, q_{t(a)+|I_a|}^2, m_{t(a)+|I_a|}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Finally, we take $\kappa = s(k_1 - \iota + 2) + 1$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_{\kappa-1}^{1,1}, \rho_{\kappa-1}^{2,2}, n_{\kappa-1}) &= (q_{k_1+1}^1, q_{k_2+1}^2, m_{k_1+1}^1), \\ (\rho_{\kappa}^{1,1}, \rho_{\kappa}^{2,2}, n_{\kappa}) &= (q_{k_1+2}^1, q_{k_2+1}^2, m_{k_2+1}^2), \\ (\rho_{\kappa+1}^{1,1}, \rho_{\kappa+1}^{2,2}) &= (q_{k_1+2}^1, q_{k_2+2}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Also, let $\rho_0^{1,2} = 0$ and $\rho_p^{1,2} = \rho_p^{2,1} = u$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \kappa + 1$. Easy to see that $(n_p)_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa}$ is nondecreasing with $n_0 = 0$ and $n_\kappa = 1$. From the construction of $(\rho_p^{j,j'})_{0 \leq p \leq \kappa+1, 1 \leq j, j' \leq 2}$, observe that

- (i) we define $(\rho_{p+1}^{1,1}, \rho_{p+1}^{2,2})$ by changing the value in only one of the coordinates from the previous step $(\rho_p^{1,1}, \rho_p^{2,2})$ for every $1 \leq p \leq \kappa$;
- (ii) $\xi'_{j,j'}(\rho_{p+1}^{j,j'}) - \xi'_{j,j'}(\rho_p^{j,j'}) = 0$ for all $j \neq j'$ and $1 \leq p \leq \kappa$;
- (iii) $|\xi'_{j,j'}(u)| \leq \xi'_{1,1}(q_\iota^1)^{1/2} \xi'_{2,2}(q_\iota^2)^{1/2}$ by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

They together ensure the existence of the jointly centered Gaussian r.v. (y_p^1, y_p^2) for $0 \leq p \leq \kappa$, which satisfy (3.1) and are independent of each other. In particular, (y_0^1, y_0^2) satisfies $\mathbb{E}(y_0^1)^2 = \xi'_{1,1}(q_\iota^1)$, $\mathbb{E}(y_0^2)^2 = \xi'_{2,2}(q_\iota^2)$, and $\mathbb{E}(y_0^1 y_0^2) = \xi'_{1,2}(u)$. This completes the assignment of the parameters.

Now we use these parameters for $Y_0(\lambda)$. Applying the mean value theorem and (3.7) to $Y_0(\lambda) - \lambda u$ gives

$$Y_0(\lambda) - \lambda u \leq Y_0(0) + (Y'_0(0) - u)\lambda + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}, \forall \lambda,$$

and minimizing the right-hand side of this inequality with respect to λ and using (3.2) yield

$$p_{N,u} \leq Y_0(0) - \frac{1}{2}(Y'_0(0) - u)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j'=1}^2 \sum_{p=0}^{\kappa} n_p(\theta_{j,j'}(\rho_{p+1}^{j,j'}) - \theta_{j,j'}(\rho_p^{j,j'})). \quad (3.10)$$

To complete the proof, our final task is to check that the three terms on the right-hand side of (3.10) together give the asserted inequality. Using definitions of $A_{j,p}$'s and $D_{j,p}$'s, the observation (i), and our construction (3.8) and (3.9), one sees that

$$D_{1,1} = A_{1,\iota} \text{ and } D_{2,1} = A_{2,\iota}. \quad (3.11)$$

Let us find an upper bound for $Y_0(0)$. Note that from Jensen's inequality,

$$A_{j,p}(x) = \frac{1}{m_p^j} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m_p^j A_{j,p+1}(x + z_p^j) \geq \mathbb{E} A_{j,p+1}(x + z_p^j).$$

So by decreasing induction on p ,

$$\mathbb{E} A_{j,\iota} \left(h^j + \sum_{0 \leq p < \iota} z_p^j \right) \leq \mathbb{E} A_{j,0}(h^j) = X_0^j,$$

where X_0^j is defined as in (2.2) using $(k_j, \mathbf{m}^j, \mathbf{q}^j)$, $\xi_{j,j}$, and h^j . Since y_0^j is equal to $\sum_{0 \leq p < \iota} z_p^j$ in distribution, it follows from this inequality, (3.5), and (3.11) that

$$Y_0(0) \leq X_0^1 + X_0^2. \quad (3.12)$$

Next, we compute $Y'_0(0)$. Similar to (2.18) and (2.19), the function $A_{j,\iota}$ and Φ_{j,μ^j} are related by $A_{j,\iota}(x) = \Phi_{j,\mu^j}(x, q_\iota^j)$. From this, (3.6), and (3.11),

$$Y'_0(0) = \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{1,\mu^1}}{\partial x}(h^1 + y_0^1, q_\iota^1) \frac{\partial \Phi_{2,\mu^2}}{\partial x}(h^2 + y_0^2, q_\iota^2). \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, a direct computation using (3.8), (3.9), and the observation (ii) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j'=1}^2 \sum_{p=0}^{\kappa} n_p(\theta_{j,j'}(\rho_{p+1}^{j,j'}) - \theta_{j,j'}(\rho_p^{j,j'})) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=\iota}^{k_1+1} m_p^1(\theta_{1,1}(q_{p+1}^1) - \theta_{1,1}(q_p^1)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=\iota}^{k_2+1} m_p^2(\theta_{2,2}(q_{p+1}^2) - \theta_{2,2}(q_p^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.10), (3.12), (3.13), and this equation together completes our proof. $\square$

4 Determination of the location for the overlap

Recall the Gibbs measures G_N^1 and G_N^2 using the Hamiltonians H_N^1 and H_N^2 from (1.6) for the two mixed even-spin systems introduced in Section 1. Throughout this section, we will assume that their external fields h^1 and h^2 satisfy $\mathbb{E}(h^1)^2 \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(h^2)^2 \neq 0$. For $j = 1, 2$, let us denote by μ_P^j a Parisi measure for the j -th system and by Φ_{j,μ_P^j} the function defined as in (2.8) using $\xi_{j,j}$, h^j , μ_P^j . From the positivity of the Parisi measure (2.5), $c_j = \min \text{supp} \mu_P^j > 0$. Let us also remark that $c_j < 1$. Indeed, as in (2.13), if $c_j = 1$, it means that μ_P^j is replica symmetric and c_j has to satisfy $c_j = \mathbb{E} \tanh^2 Y < 1$, where $Y = \xi'_{j,j}(c_j)^{1/2} w$ for some standard Gaussian w . We will use the bound (3.4) to determine the constant u_f stated in Theorems 1, 2, and 3 and furthermore, to study the behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ in $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$.

4.1 Determination of u_f

Suppose that $0 \leq v_1, v_2 \leq 1$. We define

$$\phi_{v_1, v_2}(u) = \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{1, \mu_P^1}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi^1, v_1) \frac{\partial \Phi_{2, \mu_P^2}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi^2, v_2) \quad (4.1)$$

for $|u| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}$, where χ^1 and χ^2 are jointly centered Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}(\chi^1)^2 = \xi'_{1,1}(v_1)$, $\mathbb{E}(\chi^2)^2 = \xi'_{2,2}(v_2)$, and $\mathbb{E}\chi^1 \chi^2 = \xi'_{1,2}(u)$. As we have explained in the proof of Theorem 5, the function ϕ_{v_1, v_2} is well-defined. The constant u_f can be determined by ϕ_{c_1, c_2} through the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *ϕ_{c_1, c_2} maps $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$ into itself and it has a unique fixed point u_f . In addition, if h^1 and h^2 are independent and symmetric with respect to the origin, then $u_f = 0$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{E}(h^1)^2 \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(h^2)^2 \neq 0$, from (d) in Proposition 1, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{j, \mu_P^j}}{\partial x}(h^j + \chi^j, c_j)^2 = c_j, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\xi''_{j,j}(c_j) \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_{j, \mu_P^j}}{\partial x^2}(h^j + \chi^j, c_j)^2 \leq 1. \quad (4.3)$$

Let $v_1 = c_2$, $v_2 = c_2$, and set

$$F_1(x) = \frac{\partial \Phi_{1, \mu_P^1}}{\partial x}(x, c_1) \text{ and } F_2(x) = \frac{\partial \Phi_{2, \mu_P^2}}{\partial x}(x, c_2).$$

Then (4.2) and (4.3) imply (2.10) and (2.11). In addition, from (b) in Proposition 1, F_1 and F_2 satisfy the required assumptions of Theorem 5. Thus, ϕ_{c_1, c_2} maps $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$ into itself and has a unique fixed point u_f . Suppose that h^1 and h^2 are independent and symmetric with respect to the origin. From (c) in Proposition 1, since

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{1, \mu_P^1}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c_1) \text{ and } \frac{\partial \Phi_{2, \mu_P^2}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c_2)$$

are odd functions, one may see clearly that

$$\phi_{c_1, c_2}(0) = \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{1, \mu_P^1}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi^1, c_1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{2, \mu_P^2}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi^2, c_1) = 0 \cdot 0 = 0,$$

where in this case χ^1 and χ^2 are independent. Thus, $u_f = 0$ and this completes our proof. $\square$

4.2 the behavior of the overlap in $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$

Recall that $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the Gibbs average with respect to $(G_N^1 \times G_N^2)^{\otimes \infty}$. The behavior of the overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ inside $[-\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \sqrt{c_1 c_2}]$ can be described by the theorem below. For $c_1 \leq v_1 < 1$, $c_2 \leq v_2 < 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a set

$$S_\varepsilon(u_f, v_1, v_2) = \begin{cases} \{x : -\sqrt{v_1 v_2} \leq x \leq \sqrt{c_1 c_2}, |x - u_f| \geq \varepsilon\}, & \text{if } u_f = \sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \\ \{x : -\sqrt{c_1 c_2} \leq x \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}, |x - u_f| \geq \varepsilon\}, & \text{if } u_f = -\sqrt{c_1 c_2}, \\ \{x : -\sqrt{v_1 v_2} \leq x \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}, |x - u_f| \geq \varepsilon\}, & \text{if } |u_f| < \sqrt{c_1 c_2}. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7. *Let u_f be the fixed point of ϕ_{c_1, c_2} . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $c_1 < v_1 < 1$, $c_2 < v_2 < 1$, and $K > 0$ that are all independent of N such that for $N \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \in S_\varepsilon(u_f, v_1, v_2)) \rangle \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{K}{N}\right). \quad (4.4)$$

The core of the proof for this theorem is based on the following proposition. Similar to (2.4), let $\mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h^1)$ and $\mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h^2)$ be the variational formulas corresponding to the two systems.

Proposition 4. *For any two $0 < v_1, v_2 < 1$, we have that for $|u| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} p_{N,u} &\leq \mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h_1) + \mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h_2) - \frac{1}{2} (\phi_{v_1, v_2}(u) - u)^2 \\ &\quad + (\theta_{1,1}(v_1) - \theta_{1,1}(c_1))_+ + (\theta_{2,2}(v_2) - \theta_{2,2}(c_2))_+. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Proof of Theorem 7: Since the proof for the three cases of u_f are the same, we will only present the detail for the case $u_f = \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, since u_f is the unique fixed point of ϕ_{c_1, c_2} , it implies

$$\varepsilon_1^* := \frac{1}{2} \min\{|\phi_{c_1, c_2}(u) - u|^2 : u \in S_\varepsilon(u_f, c_1, c_2)\} > 0.$$

Recall $S_N := \{i/N : -N \leq i \leq N\}$. Taking $v_1 = c_1, v_2 = c_2$ and applying (4.5), we have that

$$p_{N,u} \leq \mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h^1) + \mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h^2) - \varepsilon_1^* \quad (4.6)$$

for all $N \geq 1$ and $u \in S_N \cap S_\varepsilon(u_f, c_1, c_2)$. On the other hand, since the mapping $(u, v_1, v_2) \mapsto \phi_{v_1, v_2}(u)$ is a continuous function on the space

$$\{(u, v_1, v_2) : 0 \leq v_1, v_2 \leq 1, |u| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}\}$$

and it satisfies that $(\phi_{c_1, c_2}(-u_f) + u_f)^2 > 0$ and $\lim_{v_j \downarrow c_j} (\theta_{j,j}(v_j) - \theta_{j,j}(c_j))_+ = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, there exist $c_1 < v_1 < 1$, $c_2 < v_2 < 1$, and $\varepsilon_2^* > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\phi_{v_1, v_2}(u) - u)^2 - (\theta_{1,1}(v_1) - \theta_{1,1}(c_1))_+ - (\theta_{2,2}(v_2) - \theta_{2,2}(c_2))_+ \geq \varepsilon_2^*$$

for all $u \in S_N$ with $-\sqrt{v_1 v_2} \leq u \leq -\sqrt{c_1 c_2}$ and from (4.5), these u 's satisfy for $N \geq 1$,

$$p_{N,u} \leq \mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h^1) + \mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h^2) - \varepsilon_2^*. \quad (4.7)$$

From (4.6) and (4.7), we conclude that for $N \geq 1$,

$$p_{N,u} \leq \mathcal{P}^1(\xi_{1,1}, h^1) + \mathcal{P}^2(\xi_{2,2}, h^2) - \min(\varepsilon_1^*, \varepsilon_2^*) \quad (4.8)$$

for $u \in S_N \cap S_\varepsilon(u_f, v_1, v_2)$. As an immediate consequence of concentration of measure for the Gaussian r.v. $\mathcal{G}^1$, $\mathcal{G}^2$ and the r.v. $(h_i^1)_{i \leq N}$, $(h_i^2)_{i \leq N}$ (see for instances, Theorem 13.4.3 and the argument of the positivity of the overlap on page 449 in [18]), (4.4) follows from (4.8). $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4: Let $(k_1, \mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1)$ and $(k_2, \mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2)$ be two arbitrary triplets. We denote by μ^j the probability measure and by Φ_{j, μ^j} the PDE solution (2.7) corresponding to the triplet μ^j . Suppose for the moment that $q_\iota^1 = v_1$ and $q_\iota^2 = v_2$ for some ι with $1 \leq \iota \leq \min(k_1, k_2) + 1$. Then $|u| \leq \sqrt{q_\iota^1 q_\iota^2}$. Applying $(k_j, \mathbf{m}^j, \mathbf{q}^j)$, ι , and u to Proposition 2, we obtain the bound (3.4).

Now we check that (3.4) will yield (4.5). Let δ_1 and δ_2 satisfy $0 < \delta_1 < c_1$ and $0 < \delta_2 < c_2$. For convenience, we denote by C_1 the first term and C_2 the second term of the last line of the inequality (3.4). If $q_\iota^j \leq c_j - \delta_j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &\leq \max\{m_p^j : q_p^j \leq c_j - \delta_j\} \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \iota-1} (\theta_{j,j}(q_{p+1}^j) - \theta_{j,j}(q_p^j)) \\ &\leq \mu^j([0, c_j - \delta_j]) \theta_{j,j}(1); \end{aligned}$$

if $q_\iota^j > c_j - \delta_j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &\leq \max\{m_p^j : q_p^j \leq c_j - \delta_j\} \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \iota-1} (\theta_{j,j}(q_{p+1}^j) - \theta_{j,j}(q_p^j)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq p \leq \iota-1: q_p^j > c_j - \delta_j} (\theta_{j,j}(q_{p+1}^j) - \theta_{j,j}(q_p^j)) \\ &\leq \mu^j([0, c_j - \delta_j]) \theta_{j,j}(1) + \theta_{j,j}(v_j) - \theta_{j,j}(c_j - \delta_j). \end{aligned}$$

As a summary, we have

$$C_j \leq \mu^j([0, c_j - \delta_j]) \theta_{j,j}(1) + (\theta_{j,j}(v_j) - \theta_{j,j}(c_j - \delta_j))_+. \quad (4.9)$$

Finally, combining (3.4) and (4.9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{N,u} &\leq \mathcal{P}_{k_1}^1(\mathbf{m}^1, \mathbf{q}^1) + \mathcal{P}_{k_2}^2(\mathbf{m}^2, \mathbf{q}^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \Phi_{1,\mu^1}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi^1, v_1) \frac{\partial \Phi_{2,\mu^2}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi^2, v_2) - u \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \mu^1([0, c_1 - \delta_1])\theta_{1,1}(1) + (\theta_{1,1}(v_1) - \theta_{1,1}(c_1 - \delta_1))_+ \\
&\quad + \mu^2([0, c_2 - \delta_2])\theta_{2,2}(1) + (\theta_{2,2}(v_2) - \theta_{2,2}(c_2 - \delta_2))_+.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where χ_1 and χ_2 are jointly centered Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}\chi_1^2 = \xi'_{1,1}(v_1)$, $\mathbb{E}\chi_2^2 = \xi'_{2,2}(v_2)$, and $\mathbb{E}\chi_1\chi_2 = \xi'_{1,2}(u)$. Taking any two sequences of triplets $(k_{1,n}, \mathbf{m}_n^1, \mathbf{q}_n^1)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(k_{2,n}, \mathbf{m}_n^2, \mathbf{q}_n^2)_{n \geq 1}$ such that their corresponding probability measures $(\mu_n^1)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\mu_n^2)_{n \geq 1}$ converge weakly to μ_P^1 and μ_P^2 , respectively. We may also require that $q_{\iota_n}^1 = v_1$ and $q_{\iota_n}^2 = v_2$ for some $1 \leq \iota_n \leq \min(k_{1,n}, k_{2,n}) + 1$ for each n . Applying these triplets to (4.10), (a) in Proposition 1, and then letting $\delta_j \downarrow 0$, the asserted result follows. $\square$

5 Controlling overlaps using identities

Recall from Section 1 that G_N^1 and G_N^2 are the Gibbs measures corresponding to the Hamiltonians H_N^1 and H_N^2 as in (1.6) using temperature β_1 and β_2 , disorder $\mathcal{G}^1$ and $\mathcal{G}^2$, and external field h^1 and h^2 , respectively. Throughout this section, we will assume that h^1 and h^2 are jointly Gaussian (might not be centered). Recall that c_j is the minimum value of the support of the Parisi measure μ_P^j for $j = 1, 2$. The major goal of this section is to prove that under the assumptions of Theorems 1 and 2, the following theorems hold that will be used in the problems of chaos in temperature and disorder. Recall the definitions of $(t_p)_{p \geq 1}$, $\mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathcal{I}_1$, $\mathcal{I}_2$, (C_1) , and (C_2) from Section 1.

Theorem 8. *Let $t_p = 1$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ satisfy (C_1) and (C_2) , respectively. Then for $j = 1, 2$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| > \sqrt{c_j} + \varepsilon) \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \tag{5.1}$$

If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| > \sqrt{c_1 c_2} + \varepsilon) \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Theorem 9. *Suppose that $0 \leq t_p < 1$ for some $p \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, if $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$, then (5.1) holds. If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then we have (5.2).*

The importance of Theorems 8 and 9 lies on the fact that they allow us to exclude the discussion on the cases $|u| > \sqrt{c_j}$ when $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 = 0$ and $|u| > \sqrt{c_1 c_2}$ when $\text{Var}(h^1)^2 \neq 0$, $\text{Var}(h^2)^2 \neq 0$ in the control of the coupled free energy $p_{N,u}$ using Guerra's bound, which are technically very hard to deal with. Our approach to Theorems 8 and 9 is intimately motivated by [5]. As we have explained in Section 1, we will derive the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities as well as a new family of identities for the overlaps in the coupled system to

control the cross overlap $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ using the overlaps $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ and $R(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1, \boldsymbol{\tau}^2)$ from each individual system. Let us remark that in the statements of Theorems 8 and 9, the first parts (5.1) have been considered in Theorems 3, 4 [5], while the second parts (5.2) are new that strongly rely on the positivity of the overlap (2.6).

5.1 Identities for the coupled system

Given replicas $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\ell, \boldsymbol{\tau}^\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$, let us denote by

$$R_{\ell, \ell'}^1 = R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\ell, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\ell'}), \quad R_{\ell, \ell'}^2 = R(\boldsymbol{\tau}^\ell, \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\ell'}), \quad R_{\ell, \ell'} = R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\ell, \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\ell'}),$$

the overlaps within each system and between the two systems. For any bounded function f depending only on the overlaps $(R_{\ell, \ell'}^1)_{\ell, \ell' \leq n}$, $(R_{\ell, \ell'}^2)_{\ell, \ell' \leq n}$, and $(R_{\ell, \ell'})_{\ell, \ell' \leq n}$ and any $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$, we define

$$\Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi) = \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,n+1}^1) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle \psi(R_{1,2}^1) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=2}^n \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,\ell}^1) \rangle, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi) = \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,n+1}) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,\ell}) \rangle, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\Phi_{2,n}(f, \psi) = \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,n+1}^2) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle \psi(R_{1,2}^2) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=2}^n \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{1,\ell}^2) \rangle, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\Psi_{2,n}(f, \psi) = \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{n+1,1}) \rangle - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbb{E} \langle f \psi(R_{\ell,1}) \rangle. \quad (5.6)$$

In what follows, we will prove that these four quantities converge to zero as N tends to infinity for either all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ or all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ depending on the parameters of the models. Equations (5.3) and (5.5) will yield the familiar Ghirlanda-Guerra identities [7], only now the function f may depend on the overlaps of the two systems. As for equations (5.4) and (5.6), they will provide additional information about how two systems interact with each other. We will use the notation throughout the section:

$$\psi_a(x) = x^a.$$

Write $(h^1, h^2) = (x^1 + s_1 g^1, x^2 + s_2 g^2)$, where $x^1, x^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1 = \text{Var}(h^1)^{1/2}$, $s_2 = \text{Var}(h^2)^{1/2}$, and g^1, g^2 are jointly centered Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}(g^1)^2 = \mathbb{E}(g^2)^2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}g^1 g^2 = t$ for some $t \in [-1, 1]$. The following lemma is the key to establish the asserted identities for the coupled system.

Lemma 5. *For all $p \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\beta_{2,p} \sqrt{1 - t_p} \Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p})| = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\beta_{1,p} \sqrt{1 - t_p} \Psi_{2,n}(f, \psi_{2p})| = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\beta_{1,p} \Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p}) + \beta_{2,p} t_p \Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p})| = 0, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\beta_{2,p} \Phi_{2,n}(f, \psi_{2p}) + \beta_{1,p} t_p \Psi_{2,n}(f, \psi_{2p})| = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

We also have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |s_2 \sqrt{1-|t|} \Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_1)| = 0, \quad (5.11)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |s_1 \sqrt{1-|t|} \Psi_{2,n}(f, \psi_1)| = 0, \quad (5.12)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |s_1 \Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi_1) + s_2 t \Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_1)| = 0, \quad (5.13)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |s_2 \Phi_{2,n}(f, \psi_1) + s_1 t \Psi_{2,n}(f, \psi_1)| = 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. Our proof basically follows the same argument as Lemma 2 [5]. Let $X_{N,p}^1(\sigma)$ and $X_{N,p}^2(\tau)$ be the pure $2p$ -spin Hamiltonian in $X_N^1(\sigma)$ and $X_N^2(\tau)$. They are equal in distribution to the pair

$$\sqrt{t_p} X_{N,p}(\sigma) + \sqrt{1-t_p} Z_{N,p}^1(\sigma) \text{ and } \sqrt{t_p} X_{N,p}(\tau) + \sqrt{1-t_p} Z_{N,p}^2(\tau),$$

where we denote by $X_{N,p}$, $Z_{N,p}^1$, $Z_{N,p}^2$ three independent copies of (1.2). The derivation of (5.7) – (5.10) is based on the concentration of the Hamiltonians (see Lemma 1 [5] and also Chapter 12 [18]): as $N \rightarrow 0$,

$$\Delta_p^1, \Delta_p^2, \Gamma_p^1, \Gamma_p^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_p^1 &= N^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle |Z_{N,p}^2(\sigma^1) - \mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^2(\sigma^1) \rangle| \rangle, \\ \Delta_p^2 &= N^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle |Z_{N,p}^1(\tau^1) - \mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^1(\tau^1) \rangle| \rangle, \\ \Gamma_p^1 &= N^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle |X_{N,p}^1(\sigma^1) - \mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^1(\sigma^1) \rangle| \rangle, \\ \Gamma_p^2 &= N^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle |X_{N,p}^2(\tau^1) - \mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^2(\tau^1) \rangle| \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For f with $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$, one may see clearly

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1} |\mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^2(\sigma^1) f \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^2(\sigma^1) \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle| &\leq \Delta_p^1, \\ N^{-1} |\mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^1(\tau^1) f \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle Z_{N,p}^1(\tau^1) \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle| &\leq \Delta_p^2, \\ N^{-1} |\mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^1(\sigma^1) f \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^1(\sigma^1) \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle| &\leq \Gamma_p^1, \\ N^{-1} |\mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^2(\tau^1) f \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle X_{N,p}^2(\tau^1) \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle f \rangle| &\leq \Gamma_p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

A simple application of the Gaussian integration by parts to each term of the left-hand side of (5.16) together with (5.15) yields (5.7), (5.8), (5.9), and (5.10). One may refer to Lemma 2 [5] for detail. Similarly, since h^1, h^2 are jointly Gaussian, (5.11), (5.12), (5.13), and (5.14) can also be treated by applying the same argument as above to the external fields.

□

We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Psi_{j,n}(f, \psi)| = 0 \quad (5.17)$$

holds with $\psi = \psi_a$ for some $a \geq 1$. If $a \in 2\mathbb{N}$, then (5.17) also holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$; if $a = 1$, then (5.17) holds for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$.

Proof. It suffices to consider $j = 1$. Observe that for $\ell \geq 2$, using symmetry between replicas yields

$$\mathbb{E} \langle ((R_{1,1})^a - (R_{1,\ell})^a)^2 \rangle = 2\mathbb{E} \langle (R_{1,1})^{2a} \rangle - 2\mathbb{E} \langle (R_{1,1})^a (R_{1,2})^a \rangle = -2\Psi_{1,1}(f, \psi_a) \quad (5.18)$$

by definition of $\Psi_{1,n}$ in (5.4) with $n = 1$ and $f = (R_{1,1})^a$. If $a \in 2\mathbb{N}$, using $|x-y|^a \leq |x^a - y^a|$ for all $x, y \geq 0$ and (5.18), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle ||R_{1,1}| - |R_{1,\ell}|| \rangle &\leq (\mathbb{E} \langle ||R_{1,1}| - |R_{1,\ell}||^{2a} \rangle)^{1/2a} \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E} \langle ((R_{1,1})^a - (R_{1,\ell})^a)^2 \rangle)^{1/2a} = (-2\Psi_{1,1}(f, \psi_a))^{1/2a}. \end{aligned}$$

Since (5.17) holds for ψ_a , this inequality implies that $|R_{1,\ell}| \approx |R_{1,1}|$ for all $\ell \geq 2$ and clearly (5.17) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. If (5.17) holds for ψ_1 , then (5.18) implies $R_{1,1} \approx R_{1,\ell}$ for all $\ell \geq 1$ and so (5.17) holds for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. This completes our proof. $\square$

Recall the positivity of the overlap (2.6) that if $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 \neq 0$, one may pass to limit to see

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle I(R_{1,\ell}^j \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq \ell \leq n) \rangle = 1, \forall n \geq 1. \quad (5.19)$$

We continue to state two useful propositions that will need the help of Lemmas 5, 6, and (5.19) under additional assumptions on the parameters of the models.

Proposition 5. *Suppose that $t_p = 1$ for all $p \geq 1$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, if $\mathcal{I}_j$ satisfies (C_j) , then (5.17) and*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{j,n}(f, \psi)| = 0 \quad (5.20)$$

hold for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. If $\mathcal{I}_j$ satisfies (C_j) and $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$.

Proof. To prove the first assertion, it suffices to consider $j = 1$. Since $\mathcal{I}_1$ satisfies condition (C_1) , there exist $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_1$ with $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_0$, $p_0 \in \mathcal{I}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\beta_{2,p} = \nu\beta_{1,p}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\beta_{2,p_0} \neq \nu\beta_{1,p_0}$. Since $\beta_{1,p_0} \neq 0$, $\nu' := \beta_{2,p_0}/\beta_{1,p_0} \neq \nu$. From (5.9), we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p_0}) + \nu'\Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p_0})| = 0 \quad (5.21)$$

and that using $\beta_{2,p} = \nu\beta_{1,p}$ and $\beta_{1,p} \neq 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p}) + \nu\Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p})| = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and ψ_{2p_0} is even, we can approximate ψ_{2p_0} uniformly by the linear combination of 1 and ψ_{2p} for $p \in \mathcal{A}$ to obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p_0}) + \nu\Psi_{1,n}(f, \psi_{2p_0})| = 0. \quad (5.23)$$

From $\nu \neq \nu'$, (5.21) and (5.23) imply that (5.17) holds for ψ_{2p_0} and from Lemma 6, (5.17) holds for all even $C[-1, 1]$. This together with (5.22) implies (5.20) for all ψ_{2p} with $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and then $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ yields (5.20) for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. This completes the proof of the first assertion.

Next, suppose that $\mathcal{I}_j$ satisfies (C_j) and $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$. The use of $\psi_1(x) = |x| + 2\min(0, x)$, the positivity of the overlaps (5.19), and the first assertion (5.20) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{j,n}(f, \psi_1)| &\leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{j,n}(f, |x|)| \\ &+ 2 \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\Phi_{j,n}(f, \min(0, x))| = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Note that $s_1, s_2 \neq 0$. Let us use (5.11) and (5.12) if $|t| < 1$ or use (5.13), (5.14), and (5.24) if $|t| = 1$ to get (5.17) for $\psi = \psi_1$. Consequently, (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ by Lemma 6. This finishes our proof. $\square$

Proposition 6. *Suppose that $0 \leq t_p < 1$ for some $p \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$. Then (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, if $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$, then (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$.*

Proof. Since $\beta_{1,p}, \beta_{2,p} \neq 0$ and $t_p < 1$, one may see clearly that (5.7), (5.8), and Lemma 6 together imply the first assertion. Next, using the first assertion together with (5.9) and (5.10) yields that if $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$, then (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. This proves the second assertion.

Finally, suppose that $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for both $j = 1, 2$. Note that $s_1, s_2 \neq 0$. If $|t| < 1$, we use (5.11) and (5.12) to see that for $j = 1, 2$, (5.17) is valid for both $j = 1, 2$ and $\psi = \psi_1$ and from Lemma 6, this is also true for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. Suppose that $|t| = 1$. Using the relation $x = |x| + 2\min(x, 0)$, the positivity of the overlaps (5.19), and the second assertion, we also get (5.24) for both $j = 1, 2$. Applying this to (5.13) and (5.14) yields that (5.17) for both $j = 1, 2$ and $\psi = \psi_1$ and thus, from Lemma 6, this is also true for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. This completes our proof. $\square$

5.2 Proofs of Theorems 8 and 9

The proofs of Theorems 8 and 9 rely on the following two propositions.

Proposition 7. *Suppose that (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, if (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$, then (5.1) holds.*

Proposition 8. *For both $j = 1, 2$, if (5.17) holds for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ and (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$, then (5.2) holds.*

Since the proofs of these two propositions are exactly the main ingredients of Theorems 3 and 4 in [5], we will only sketch the proof for Proposition 8 as follows. Suppose that for both $j = 1, 2$, (5.17) holds for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ and (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. Observe that from (5.17) and using symmetry between replicas, they essentially imply $R_{1,1} \approx R_{\ell,\ell'}$ for all $\ell, \ell' \leq n$ and $n \geq 1$. If (5.2) is not true, then $R_{1,1} \geq \sqrt{c'_1 c'_2}$ has nonzero probability for some c'_1, c'_2 satisfying $c_1 < c'_1 < 1$ and $c_2 < c'_2 < 1$. From the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities (see Lemma 4 [5]), the following holds with nonzero probability:

$$|R_{\ell,\ell'}| \geq \sqrt{c'_1 c'_2}, |R_{\ell,\ell'}^1| \leq c''_1, |R_{\ell,\ell'}^2| \leq c''_2$$

for all c''_1, c''_2 satisfying $c_1 < c''_1 < c'_1$ and $c_2 < c''_2 < c'_2$. However, using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to the usual inner product of $N^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1 + \dots + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^n)$ and $N^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\tau}^1 + \dots + \boldsymbol{\tau}^n)$ leads to

$$\sqrt{c'_1 c'_2} \leq |R_{1,1}| \approx \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \sum_{\ell,\ell'=1}^n R_{\ell,\ell'} \right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\ell,\ell'=1}^n |R_{\ell,\ell'}^1| \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\ell,\ell'=1}^n |R_{\ell,\ell'}^2| \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{c''_1 c''_2}.$$

This forms a contradiction since indeed $\sqrt{c''_1 c''_2} < \sqrt{c'_1 c'_2}$.

Proof of Theorem 8: For both $j = 1, 2$, since $\mathcal{I}_j$ satisfies (C_j) , it follows by Proposition 5 that (5.17) and (5.20) hold for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$. Thus, (5.1) follows for both $j = 1, 2$ from Proposition 7. If, in addition, $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then again from Proposition 5, (5.17) holds for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ and Proposition 8 implies (5.1). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 9: From the given condition $0 \leq t_p < 1$ for some $p \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$, we know that (5.17) holds for both $j = 1, 2$ and all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ by Proposition 6. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, if $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$, (5.20) is true for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ by Proposition 6 and consequently, (5.1) holds by Proposition 7. If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then (5.17) is valid for all $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ and (5.20) holds for all even $\psi \in C[-1, 1]$ by Proposition 6 and consequently, (5.2) holds by Proposition 8. $\square$

6 Proofs of Theorems 1, 2, and 3

Our last section will be the proofs of Theorems 1, 2, and 3 that are based on our main results derived in all previous sections.

Proof of Theorem 1: Using the given conditions, Theorem 8 implies (5.1) for both $j = 1, 2$. For $j = 1$ or 2 , if $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 = 0$, then from Theorem 4, $c_j = 0$ and so from (5.1), (1.8) follows. If $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ for both $j = 1, 2$, then from Theorem 7, for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $c_1 < v_1 < 1$, $c_2 < v_2 < 1$, and $K > 0$ that are independent of N such that (4.4) holds for all $N \geq 1$. On the other hand, from Theorem 9, we also have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| > \sqrt{v'_1 v'_2}) \right\rangle = 0 \quad (6.1)$$

for all $c_1 < v'_1 < v_1$ and $c_2 < v'_2 < v_2$. Combining this with (4.4) gives (1.9). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2: This part of the proof is very similar to that for Theorem 1. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}(h^j)^2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for some $j = 1, 2$. From Theorems 4 and 9, (1.8) follows. Suppose that $\text{Var}(h^j) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_j \in \mathcal{C}_j$ for both $j = 1, 2$. From Theorem 7, there are $c_1 < v_1 < 1$, $c_2 < v_2 < 1$, and $K > 0$ independent of N such that (4.4) holds for all $N \geq 1$. Also, from Theorem 9, for any (v'_1, v'_2) with $c_1 < v'_1 < v_1$ and $c_2 < v'_2 < v_2$, we have (6.1). This together with (4.4) implies (1.9). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3: Since $\beta_{1,p} = \beta_{2,p}$, $t_p = 1$ for all $p \geq 1$, and h^1, h^2 are identically distributed, the two systems are equal to each other in distribution. Thus, we may pick $\mu_P^1 = \mu_P^2$ and simply denote them by μ_P . Let $\xi := \xi_{1,1} = \xi_{2,2} = \xi_{1,2}$ and $c := \min \text{supp} \mu_P$. Note that $c > 0$ since $\mathbb{E}(h^1)^2 = \mathbb{E}(h^2)^2 \neq 0$. Let u_f be the fixed point of $\phi_{c,c}$ from Proposition 3. We claim that $|u_f| < c$. If $u_f = c$, then using $\phi_{c,c}(u_f) = u_f$ and (4.2) implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi, c) - \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi, c) \right)^2 = 2c - 2u_f = 0,$$

where χ is centered Gaussian with variance $\xi'(c)$ independent of h^1, h^2 . This means that

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi, c) = \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^2 + \chi, c) \text{ a.s.}$$

However, since $\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c)$ is strictly increasing from (b) in Proposition 1, we obtain $h^1 + \chi = h^2 + \chi$ a.s. and thus, $h^1 = h^2$ a.s. forms a contradiction. Similarly, if $u_f = -c$, then using $\phi_{c,c}(u_f) = u_f$ and (4.2) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi, c) + \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^2 - \chi, c) \right)^2 = 2c + 2u_f = 0,$$

where χ is defined as above. This means that

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^1 + \chi, c) = -\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(h^2 - \chi, c) \text{ a.s.}$$

Since $\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mu_P}}{\partial x}(\cdot, c)$ is odd and strictly increasing from (b) and (c) in Proposition 1, it follows that $h^1 + \chi = -h^2 - \chi$ a.s. and thus, $h^1 = -h^2$ a.s., a contradiction again. Thus this

completes the proof of our claim. Now for $\varepsilon > 0$, from Theorem 7 and (??), there are $c < v_1, v_2 < 1$ and $K > 0$ independent of N such that for all $N \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| \leq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}, |R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) - u_f| \geq \varepsilon) \rangle \leq K \exp \left(-\frac{N}{K} \right). \quad (6.2)$$

Recall $S_N := \{i/N : -N \leq i \leq N\}$. An advantage brought by the assumptions on the parameters for the two models is that under this setting it is slightly easier to find parameters to control Guerra's bound that yields the following statement: There are constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$ depending only on ξ such that if $0 < c' < c'' < 1$ with $\xi'(c'') - \xi'(c') < K_1$ and $(k, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q})$ is any triplet with $q_s \leq c'$ and $m_s \geq \delta$ for some $1 \leq s \leq k+1$, then

$$p_{N,u} \leq 2\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}) - \delta K_2 \int_{c'}^{c''} \mathbb{E} F_u(h^1, h^2, \xi'(q)) \xi''(q) dq \quad (6.3)$$

for all $u \in S_N$ with $c'' \leq |u| \leq 1$, where

$$F_u(x_1, x_2, w) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{E} (\tanh(x_1 + z\sqrt{w}) - \tanh(x_2 + z\sqrt{w}))^2, & \text{if } u > 0, \\ \mathbb{E} (\tanh(x_1 + z\sqrt{w}) + \tanh(x_2 - z\sqrt{w}))^2, & \text{if } u < 0 \end{cases}$$

for some standard Gaussian r.v. z . The proof of (6.3) is based on a series of applications of the Gaussian interpolation technique to the iteration scheme of the Parisi functional. One may refer to Proposition 11 [4] to a detailed discussion. Let us emphasize that although Proposition 11 [4] considers the case $h^1 = h^2$, (6.3) is indeed also true for identically distributed h^1, h^2 (see (6.17) in [4]). Now, we let $c'' = \sqrt{v_1 v_2}$ and pick c' with $c < c' < c''$ such that μ_P is continuous at c' and $\xi'(c'') - \xi'(c') < K_1$. By the definition of the Parisi measure μ_P , it is the weak limit of a sequence of probability measures $\mu_n \in \text{MIN}(\varepsilon_n)$ with $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$. Using this sequence and (6.3), we have for all $N \geq 1$,

$$p_{N,u} \leq 2\mathcal{P}(\xi, h, \mu_n) - \mu_n([0, c']) K_2 \int_{c'}^{c''} \mathbb{E} F_u(h^1, h^2, \xi'(q)) \xi''(q) dq$$

for all $u \in S_N$ with $c'' \leq |u| \leq 1$ and letting n tend to infinity implies

$$p_{N,u} \leq 2\mathcal{P}(\xi, h) - \mu_P([0, c']) K_2 \int_{c'}^{c''} \mathbb{E} F_u(h^1, h^2, \xi'(q)) \xi''(q) dq.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(h^1 \pm h^2)^2 \neq 0$, $\tanh$ is strictly increasing, and c is the smallest number in the support of μ_P , there is a constant $\varepsilon^* > 0$ independent of N such that for all $N \geq 1$,

$$p_{N,u} \leq 2\mathcal{P}(\xi, h) - \varepsilon^*$$

for all $u \in S_N$ with $c'' \leq |u| \leq 1$. Using this and concentration of measures for the Gaussian r.v. $\mathcal{G}^1, \mathcal{G}^2$, and the r.v. h^1, h^2 as we have used in the proof of Theorem 7, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle I(|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})| \geq \sqrt{v_1 v_2}) \rangle \leq K' \exp \left(-\frac{N}{K'} \right)$$

for all $N \geq 1$, where $K' > 0$ is some constant independent of N . Combining this inequality with (6.2) clearly completes the proof. $\square$

References

- [1] Billoire, A., Marinari, E. (2002) Overlap among states at different temperatures in the SK model. *Europhys. Lett.*, **60**, no. 5, 775.
- [2] Chatterjee, S. (2008) Chaos, concentration, and multiple valleys. arXiv: 0810.4221.
- [3] Chatterjee, S. (2009) Disorder chaos and multiple valleys in spin glasses. arXiv: 0907.3381.
- [4] Chen, W.-K. (2011) Disorder chaos in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model with external field. To appear in *Ann. Probab.*
- [5] Chen, W.-K., Panchenko, D. (2012) An approach to chaos in some mixed p -spin models. To appear in *Probab. Theory and Rel. Fields*.
- [6] Crisanti, A., Rizzo, T. (2003) Chaos in temperature in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **90**, no. 13, 137201.
- [7] Ghirlanda, S., Guerra, F. (1998) General properties of overlap probability distributions in disordered spin systems. Towards Parisi ultrametricity. *J. Phys. A*, **31**, no. 46, 9149-9155.
- [8] Guerra, F. (2003) Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **233**, no. 1, 1-12.
- [9] Katzgraber, H. G., Krzakala, F. (2007) Temperature and disorder chaos in three-dimensional Ising spin glasses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98**, no. 1, 017201.
- [10] Mézard, M., Parisi, G., Virasoro, M. A. (1987) Spin Glass Theory and Beyond. World Scientific Lecture Notes in Physics, **9**. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., Teaneck, NJ.
- [11] Panchenko, D. (2008) On differentiability of the Parisi formula. *Elect. Comm. in Probab.*, **13**, 241-247.
- [12] Panchenko, D., Talagrand, M. (2007) On the overlap in the multiple spherical SK models. *Ann. Probab.*, **35**, no. 6, 2321-2355.
- [13] Rizzo, T. (2009) Chaos in mean-field spin-glass models. Spin glasses: statics and dynamics, 143-157, Progr. Probab., **62**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel.
- [14] Rudin, W. (1987) Real and complex analysis. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.
- [15] Sherrington, D., Kirkpatrick, S. (1975) Solvable model of a spin glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **35**, 1792-1796.
- [16] Talagrand, M. (2006) The Parisi formula. *Ann. of Math.* (2), **163**, no. 1, 221-263.
- [17] Talagrand, M. (2006) Parisi measures. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **231**, 269-286.
- [18] Talagrand, M. (2011) Mean-Field Models for Spin Glasses. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*, **54**, **55**. Springer-Verlag.
- [19] Toninelli, F. (2002) About the Almeida-Thouless transition line in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick mean field spin glass model. *Europhysics letters*, **60**, no. 50, 764-767.